Impact of 40 % UIF on OID/SSJID's Diversions

August 22, 2018 – Item 4

By: Tim O'Laughlin
Attorney for San Joaquin Tributaries Authority

The SED claims that the Lower San Joaquin River alternatives will – depending on the alternative – reduce diversions in the LSJR Plan Area on average 7 to 14 percent (SED at p. 5-73; Table 5-19a)

Year	Water Year Type	Districts' Entitlement under the 1988 Agreement in TAF	OID/SSJID Allocations under the SWB's 40% UIF in TAF	Δ Between Districts' Entitlement and Allocation under 40% UIF in TAF	Amount of Reduced Diversion as a % of Districts' Entitlement
1922	W	600	507	93	16%
1923	AN	600	512	88	15%
1924	C	457	252	205	45%
1925	BN	600	451	149	25%
1926	D	600	305	295	49%
1927	AN	600	358	242	40%
1928	BN	600	522	78	13%
1929	C	537	261	276	51%
1930	C	600	314	286	48%
1931	C	492	217	275	56%
1932	AN	600	363	237	40%
1933	D	591	319	272	46%
1934	C	532	221	311	58%
1935	AN	600	326	274	46%

Pictured here are modeling results showing the impact of the Board's preferred alternative, 40% UIF from February – June, for the years 1922 – 1935 on the Districts' diversions. The far right column shows the difference between the amount the Districts would have been shorted by the 40% UIF requirement as a percentage of the Districts' total entitlement for that year.

Amount of Reduced Diversion as a % of Districts' Entitlement
16%
15%
45%
25%
49%
40%
13%
51%
48%
56%
40%
46%
58%
46%

Pictured here is the far right column from the previous slide, showing the difference between the amount the Districts would have been shorted by the 40% UIF requirement as a percentage of the Districts' total entitlement for that year under the 1988 Agreement.

Year	Water Year Type	Districts' Water Demand in TAF *	OID/SSJID Allocations under the SWB's 40% UIF in TAF	Δ Between Districts' Water Demands and Districts' Allocation under 40% UIF in TAF	Δ Between Districts' Water Demand and Allocation under 40% UIF as a % of Districts' Water Demand
1922	W	506	507	-1	n/a
1923	AN	507	512	-5	n/a
1924	C	630	252	378	60%
1925	BN	444	451	-7	n/a
1926	D	559	305	254	45%
1927	AN	515	358	157	30%
1928	BN	509	522	-13	n/a
1929	C	530	261	269	51%
1930	C	559	314	245	44%
1931	C	549	217	332	60%
1932	AN	531	363	168	32%
1933	D	574	319	255	44%
1934	C	564	221	343	61%
1935	AN	464	326	138	30%

* This column only shows water used for crop irrigation. It does not take into account water used for storage, transfer, or other uses.

Pictured here are modeling results showing the Districts' water demands from 1922 – 1935 and the impact that the 40% UIF requirement would have had on the Districts' diversions. The far right column shows the difference between the Districts' water demands for that year and the Districts' Allocation under the 40% UIF requirement as a percentage of the Districts' total water demand.

Δ Between Districts' Water Demand and Allocation under 40% UIF as a % of Districts' Water Demand
n/a
n/a
60%
n/a
45%
30%
n/a
51%
44%
60%
32%
44%
61%
30%

Pictured here is the far right column from the previous slide, showing the difference between the Districts' Water Demand for each year and what the Districts would have been allocated under the 40% UIF requirement, shown as a percentage of the Districts' total Water Demand.

As the previous slides show, the problem with averages is that they mask significant impacts

Year	Water Year Type	Districts' Entitlement under the 1988 Agreement in TAF	SED's Claim of CVP Contractors' Allocation under 40% UIF in TAF	CVP Contractors' Allotment SWB Baseline in TAF	Δ Between CVP Contractors' Allocation under 40% UIF and Baseline as a % of Baseline
1922	W	600	155	155	n/a
1923	AN	600	155	155	n/a
1924	C	457	31	78	60%
1925	BN	600	124	136	8%
1926	D	600	31	78	60%
1927	AN	600	87	136	36%
1928	BN	600	102	78	n/a
1929	C	537	20	24	16%
1930	C	600	0	16	100%
1931	C	492	0	3	100%
1932	AN	600	4	12	67%
1933	D	591	1	16	94%
1934	C	532	0	3	100%
1935	AN	600	47	12	n/a

Pictured here are the 40% UIF requirement's impacts on CVP Contractors receiving water from New Melones. The fourth column lists the SED's claim of CVP Contractors' Allocation under 40% UIF. The fifth column shows CVP Contractors' Baseline Allocations for the same years. The final column shows the amount, if any, the 40% UIF requirement would short CVP Contractors, shown as a % of their Baseline Allocation for that year.

Δ Between CVP Contractors Allocation under 40% UIF and Baseline as a % of Baseline
n/a
n/a
60%
8%
60%
36%
n/a
16%
100%
100%
67%
94%
100%
n/a

Pictured here is the far right column from the previous slide showing the amount, if any, the 40% UIF requirement would short CVP Contractors, shown as a % of their Baseline Allocation for that year.

Year	Water Year Type	Districts' Entitlement under the 1988 Agreement in TAF	Actual CVP Contractors' Allocation Under 40% UIF in TAF	CVP Contractors' Allotment SWB Baseline in TAF	Δ Between Actual CVP Contractors' Allocation under 40% UIF and Baseline as a % of Baseline
1922	W	600	155	155	n/a
1923	AN	600	155	155	n/a
1924	C	457	0	78	100%
1925	BN	600	55	136	60%
1926	D	600	0	78	100%
1927	AN	600	55	136	60%
1928	BN	600	55	78	29%
1929	C	537	0	24	100%
1930	C	600	0	16	100%
1931	C	492	0	3	100%
1932	AN	600	0	12	100%
1933	D	591	0	16	100%
1934	C	532	0	3	100%
1935	AN	600	47	12	n/a

Pictured here are the 40% UIF requirement's impacts on CVP Contractors receiving water from New Melones. The fourth column lists CVP Contractors' **actual** allocations under 40% UIF for each year. The fifth column shows CVP Contractors' Baseline Allocations for the same years. The final column shows the amount, if any, the 40% UIF requirement would short CVP Contractors, shown as a % of their Baseline Allocation for that year.

Δ Between Actual CVP Contractors' Allocation under 40% UIF and Baseline as a % of Baseline
n/a
n/a
100%
60%
100%
60%
29%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
n/a

Pictured here is the far right column from the previous slide showing the amount, if any, the 40% UIF requirement would short CVP Contractors, shown as a % of their Baseline Allocation for that year.

The WQCP Amendments do not provide for a "sustainable operation for New Melones Reservoir and [do] not provide a reliable water supply for Reclamation's CVP water service contractors." Consequently, "full use of the dam as Congress contemplated [will] be prevented, significantly undermining Congress's design for the long-term operation of the project to satisfy multiple policy objectives."

- Commissioner Brenda Burman, United States Bureau of Reclamation (July 27, 2018 letter to the SWB re WQCP Amendments)